APPENDIX C
Montana Libraries Survey Summary

In June of 2001, the Montana library community was offered an opportunity to offer their opinions on a number of issues and topics of importance that had been identified through a series of focus group discussions and interviews held during the previous month. There were actually three surveys: one for public library directors; one for academic, special, and institution librarians; and one for school library/media center personnel. Wherever practical, the wording of the survey questions was identical; however, the consultants explored certain areas in greater detail with representatives of the public libraries since this is an audience for which the Montana State Library has statutory responsibilities.

The surveys were originally scheduled to be conducted by mail, however, the urgency created by the impending end of the school year made it advisable to conduct the school and academic surveys via the Internet. The existence of the web surveys was announced on the Wired Montana listserv and a "hot-link" to the surveys was provided to facilitate easy access. Librarians and interested staff from all parts of the state were invited to participate. The survey of public libraries was mailed to the director of each of the legal libraries in Montana and a web version of the survey was provided as an alternate means of participation.

Limitations of the Web Surveys

Since participation in the web surveys to school, academic, special, and institution libraries was open to anyone who, having learned of the web-site, chose to complete the survey, the responses do not represent a scientific sampling of those Montana library communities. Therefore, survey results cannot be generalized to all Montana school, academic, special, and institutional libraries. Furthermore, it should be noted that it is likely that multiple people from some libraries or organizations responded to the survey. Therefore, the number of responses for a type of library does not necessarily represent the same number of libraries.

Nevertheless, the web survey results are valuable in that they provide another dimension in the array of data gathering techniques used and provide additional insight into how the Montana library community perceives the Montana State Library's performance. The survey results are best used in combination with information gathered from other sources such as the focus groups and/or interviews. The web survey serves as a mechanism that can be used to confirm or refute statements made by individuals, and to assess the strength of opinions and ideas expressed by those who participated in the interviews and focus groups.

Since the public library survey was sent to all public libraries, and since the response rate from these libraries was quite high (81.01%), the results of this survey can be construed as being a closer representation of the total population of Montana's 79 public libraries.

This summary is broken into multiple sections. The first provides a comparison of responses for all types of libraries. The other sections provide greater detail for each type of library separately.

Summary of All Types of Libraries

Who Responded to the Survey

Overall 161 responses to the surveys were received. Sixty-four public library directors, thirty-one academic, special, and institution librarians, and sixty-six school media/librarians responded. One hundred and nine of the responses came from libraries that said they participated in one of the six library federations. School libraries were the least likely to claim association with a federation.

As a whole, the survey respondents tended to be library directors of libraries with staff of two or less Full-Time-Equivalents (FTEs). The materials and online resources budgets of the majority of school library/media centers tended to be in the $ 1,001 to $ 10,000 range and most public libraries fell into the range between $ 1,001 and $ 20,000. At the other end of the spectrum, the highest percent of the academic libraries and two of the special libraries reported materials and online resources budgets of over $100,000. Seven public libraries also reported collection budgets over $ 100,000.

Contact with the Montana State Library

Survey respondents were asked to indicate which departments or programs of the Montana State Library they had contacted in the past year. The Montana Library Network (MLN) was the Montana State Library program most likely to have been contacted by all types of libraries. MLN was followed by the Library and Information Services Department. As might be anticipated, public librarians were far more likely to have contacted the Library Development Department (60.94%) than librarians from other types of libraries. Again, not surprisingly, Public library contact was also highest with the Talking Book Library (59.38%) although some school, academic, institutional and even some special libraries indicated contact with this program.

Contact with the Natural Resources Information System (NRIS) office was highest among academic libraries (50.00% for four-year public colleges and universities and for two-year community colleges). Interestingly, none of the private four-year campuses indicated any contact with NRIS. Almost thirty-six percent (35.94%) of public library respondents indicated that they had contact with NRIS during the last year.

Participation in Montana State Library and MLN Initiatives

High percents of respondents from all types of libraries said they subscribed to MLN full-text databases: Eighty-six percent (85.94%) of the public libraries, eighty-one percent (80.65%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries, and seventy percent (69.70%) of the school library/media centers. Participation in the shared catalog project was much lower: fifty-five percent (54.84%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries, thirty-four percent (34.38%) of the public libraries, and seventeen percent (16.67%) of the school library/media centers said they are participating in the project in some way. Ninety-two percent (92.19%) of the public libraries and seventy-seven percent (77.42%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries reporting said they participate in the OCLC fixed-cost contract. Less than seventeen percent (16.67%) of the school libraries said they participate in the OCLC contract.

Relative Importance of Continuing Education Providers

The Montana State Library was identified as the most important continuing education/staff development provider for the public libraries in the state. On a five-point scale, MSL averaged 4.57 in importance among the public library group. The Montana Library Association (MLA) ranked second for public libraries at 4.27. MLA was ranked as the most important continuing education provider by academic, special, institution and school librarians.

Importance of Various Continuing Education/Workshop Topics

The most important potential workshop topics for public and for academic, special, and institutional libraries were *Use of OCLC system(s)* (public - 4.46) (academic, special, institutional - 3.81) followed by *Use of MNL database project resources* (public - 4.08) (academic, special, institutional - 3.71). For the school library/media centers the most important topic was *Teaching library/information literacy skills* (4.64) followed by *Integrating technology/information literacy into the curriculum* (4.58). Academic libraries rated the closely related *Information literacy/Bibliographic Instruction* category a close third at 3.68. *Teaching information literacy skills* lagged behind *Trustee training, Basic library management skills, Collection development, and Internet searching skills* as a topic for continuing education.

Tolerable Travel Time to Continuing Education Events

The highest percents of responses on all the surveys indicated participants were willing to travel between one and one-half to two hours to attend a typical half-day training event. The second highest percent of public library and academic, special, and institution library participants were willing to travel over two hours. Among the school library/media

center respondents the second highest percent was for one to one and one-half hours of travel time.

The surveys asked participants which of a number of current or potential services the Montana State Library might provide would be most helpful to them. Respondents on all three surveys gave workshops and continuing education opportunities their highest ratings.

Participants were also asked to identify the most important role(s) for the Montana State Library in relation to their library. Public library directors gave their highest ratings (tied) for *Legislative advocacy* and for *Securing direct State aid for local libraries*. The surveys for school library/media centers and for academic, special, and institution libraries included a statement which said "Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for (your type of) libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?" Among the academic, special, and institution libraries the role receiving the highest percent was *Setting a vision for Montana libraries*. Among the school library/media center responses the highest percent was for *Providing group database licensing*.

A more detailed treatment of each of the surveys follows:

Public Library Survey Summary

A survey was mailed to all seventy-nine public library directors in the state; responses were received from sixty-four, or eighty-one percent (81.01%). All but one of the libraries (98.44%) reported that they participated in a federation. The most responses (17 or 77% of the public libraries in that federation) came from the Broad Valleys Federation, but the directors of at least seventy-three percent (73.3%) of the legal public libraries in each of the federations responded to the survey.

The highest percent of responses came from directors of libraries with one to two FTE staff:

Staff Size	Percent of responses	# of Responses
Less than 1.00 FTE	15.63%	10
1.00 FTE	9.38%	6
1.01-2.00 FTE	32.81%	21
2.01-3.00 FTE	15.63%	10
3.01-5.00 FTE	12.50%	8
5.01-10.00 FTE	4.69%	3
10.01-20.00 FTE	1.56%	1
Over 20 FTE	7.81%	5

(Note that there were so few libraries in each of the categories of 1.00 FTE, 5.01-10.00 FTE, 10.01-20.00 FTE and over 20 FTE that using percents in the comparisons of

responses below would tend to exaggerate differences. Sometimes numbers of responses are used instead of percents in the text below.)

Of the sixty-four responses, the largest group (26.56%) had a materials and online resources budget of $1,001-$5,000. Over half (56.25%) had a materials and online resources budget of $10,000 or less. Nearly eight percent (7.81%) had a materials and online resources budget of under $1,000. Only eleven percent (10.94%) had a materials and online resources budget of $100,001-$200,000.

The directors were asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) they had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over eighty-four percent (84.38%) had contacted the Montana Library Network.

MSL Department	Percent having contacted MSL Dept.
Montana Library Network (MLN)	84.38%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	76.56%
Library Development (LDD)	60.94%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	59.38%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	35.94%

The libraries with the smallest staffs contacted LISD most. Libraries with five to ten FTEs were evenly divided in their contacts with LISD, MLN, and TBL. Libraries with staffs that ranged from one to five FTEs had the highest percents of contacts with MLN.

Library by Staff Size	MSL Department Contacted By Highest Percent
Less than 1.00 FTE	LISD
1.00 FTE	LISD
1.01-2.00 FTE	MLN
2.01-3.00 FTE	MLN
3.01-5.00 FTE	MLN
5.01-10.00 FTE	LISD, MLN, TBL (all contacted by all 3 libraries in this category size)
10.01-20.00 FTE	All cited by one library
Over 20 FTE	LDD and MLN

Nearly eighty-six percent (85.94%) of the libraries subscribe to the full-text magazine databases offered by the State Library. Those that do not subscribe do not because of lack of funds, being unaware of the project or some other individually stated reason. Three library directors gave each of these answers. Of those nine negative responses, seven said they did not anticipate subscribing to the databases within the next one to three years.

Only thirty-four percent (34.38%) said their library participated in the MLN shared catalog project. The major reason given for not participating was lack of funds. Almost sixty percent (59.52%) of those not participating gave this reason. There were also a

number of additional reasons provided by the respondents: four said they were planning to join in the future; two said it seemed redundant; one said it would increase their net lender subsidy costs, and another called it a "waste of time, a pet rock project." Two-thirds (66.67%) of those not participating said they did not anticipate participating in the next one to three years.

On the other hand, over ninety-two percent (92.19%) said their library did participate in the OCLC fixed-cost contract. Of the five who did not participate, three said their reason for not participating was the lack of funds. Two said they did anticipate participating in the coming one to three years.

The directors were asked to rate the relative importance of a number of providers of continuing education/staff development workshops and programs for their staff. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the providers in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

CE Provider	Relative mean score
Montana State Library	4.57
Montana Library Association	4.27
In-house training	4.05
Regional library federation	4.03

Eight directors listed other providers they believed important. Examples were videos of workshops provided by several of those listed and local educational institutions and vendors.

The highest percent of directors from libraries with less than one FTE (80.00%) said the Regional library federations were very important (the highest rating). The highest percent from libraries with one FTE went to in-house training (83.33%). The highest percent from directors of libraries with one to two, two to three, and three to five FTEs went to the Montana State Library. Four of the five directors from libraries with over twenty FTEs gave their highest rating to the Montana Library Association.

Library by Staff Size	Provider Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating
Less than 1.00 FTE	Regional library federation
1.00 FTE	In-house training
1.01-2.00 FTE	Montana State Library
2.01-3.00 FTE	Montana State Library
3.01-5.00 FTE	Montana State Library
5.01-10.00 FTE	Montana State Library
10.01-20.00 FTE	All providers were rated Important
Over 20 FTE	Montana Library Association

The directors were also asked to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops in terms of their importance to the director and his/her staff. The

chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

Topic	Relative mean score
Use of OCLC system(s)	4.46
Use of MLN database project resources	4.08
Trustee training	3.98
Basic library management skills	3.84
Collection development	3.80
Internet searching skills	3.77
Teaching library/information literacy skills	3.55
Creating web pages	3.14

Library by Staff Size	Topic Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating
Less than 1.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s)
1.00 FTE	Internet searching skills
1.01-2.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s)
2.01-3.00 FTE	Basic library management skills, and Use of OCLC system(s) (tie)
3.01-5.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s), Trustee training
5.01-10.00 FTE	(only 3 libraries responding in this category)
10.01-20.00 FTE	(only 1 library responding in this category)
Over 20 FTE	(only 5 libraries responding—no patterns)

Over thirty-four percent (34.38%) said they were willing to travel for one and one-half to two hours for a typical half-day training event. Typically, directors from libraries with less than one FTE clustered in the thirty minutes to one and one-half hours categories; those in the one to two FTE group were willing to travel between one and two hours, as were those in the three to five FTE group.

The directors were asked to rate a number of services either provided or potentially to be provided by the State Library in terms of the degree to which they are or would be helpful to the respondent's library. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the services in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

Potential service	Relative mean score
Providing staff continuing education	4.59
Technology consulting and assistance	4.56
Group database licensing	4.38
Interlibrary loan net-lender reimbursement	4.19
Grant/funding development assistance	4.19
General library consulting services	4.17
Providing trustee continuing education	3.89
Back-up reference service	3.66
Facilities consulting	3.28

Library by staff size	*Service Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating*
Less than 1.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education
1.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education
1.01-2.00 FTE	Technology consulting and assistance
2.01-3.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education, Technology consulting and assistance
3.01-5.00 FTE	Group database licensing
5.01-10.00 FTE	Group database licensing
10.01-20.00 FTE	General library consulting services, Interlibrary loan net-lender reimbursement
Over 20 FTE	Group database licensing

The directors were asked to rate the importance of a number of roles for the Montana State Library. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the roles in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

MSL role	*Relative mean score*
Legislative advocacy	4.70
Securing direct State aid for local libraries	4.70
Coordinating/providing continuing education	4.67
Providing expert consulting services	4.57
Increasing public awareness of libraries	4.42
Providing direct services to residents with special needs	4.33
Setting a vision for Montana libraries	4.22
Help in securing improved local funding	4.14
Providing information services to State government	3.97

Library by Staff Size	*Service Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating*
Less than 1.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy
1.00 FTE	Coordinating/providing continuing education, Securing direct State aid for local libraries
1.01-2.00 FTE	Coordinating/providing continuing education
2.01-3.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Securing direct State-aid for libraries
3.01-5.00 FTE	Securing direct State aid for local libraries
5.01-10.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Coordinating/providing continuing education
10.01-20.00 FTE	(only 1 library responding in this category)
Over 20 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Securing direct State aid for local libraries, Providing direct service to residents with special needs

Academic, Special, and Institutional Library Survey Summary

A survey of Montana academic, special and institution libraries was conducted via the Internet. Thirty-one responses were received. Over sixty percent (61.29%) of the respondents were library directors, but staff with other job titles in academic and special libraries also took part.

Job title	Percent of responses	
Director	61.29%	
Reference Librarian	16.13%	
Cataloger/Bibliographer	3.23%	(one person)
Bibliographic Instruction Librarian	3.23%	(one person)
Support staff	3.23%	(one person)
Some other designation	12.90%	

The responses were about evenly split in terms of federation participation: fifty-two percent (51.61%) were federation members; forty-eight percent (48.39%) were not. Nearly forty-four percent (43.75%) of the responses came from librarians in Broad Valleys Federation.

The highest percent of responses came from libraries with one to two FTE staff:

Staff Size	Percent of responses	# of Responses
Less than 1.00 FTE	12.90%	4
1.00 FTE	6.45%	2
1.01-2.00 FTE	22.58%	7
2.01-3.00 FTE	19.35%	6
3.01-5.00 FTE	3.23%	1
5.01-10.00 FTE	19.35%	6
10.01-20.00 FTE	3.23%	1
Over 20 FTE	12.90%	4

Of the thirty-one responses, nearly thirty-seven percent (36.67%) had a materials and online resources budget of over $100,000.

The number of each type of library represented by those who responded to the survey is relatively small and does not lend itself to generalizing about all of that type of library in Montana. If the three types of academic libraries are combined, the resulting number, fifteen, represents over half (55.6%) of the academic libraries in Montana. However, it is also possible that multiple responses came from the same academic library and that there are fewer than fifteen academic libraries represented. Consequently the text that follows analyzes responses from the overall perspective of Montana academic and special libraries. (The charts included with the report do give the responses broken into the various types of libraries represented.)

Type of library	Number of responses
4 yr. Public University or College	8
4 yr. Private University or College	4
2 yr. Community/Technical College	3
Hospital/Health Science Library	6
Other Special Library	6
Institutional Library	1

The survey asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) the respondents had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over ninety percent (90.32%) had contacted the Montana Library Network
.

MSL Department	Percent having contacted MSL Dept.
Montana Library Network (MLN)	90.32%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	67.74%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	38.71%
Library Development (LDD)	29.03%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	22.58%

Over eighty percent (80.65%) said their library participated in the MLN database project. Of the six that did not participate, two said lack of funds was their main reason for not participating and they did not anticipate participating in the next one to three years. (That represents all eight 4 year public universities and all four 4 year private universities responding to the survey.)

Over half (54.84%) said their library participated in the MLN shared catalog project. Of those whose library did not participate, four cited lack of funds, three said their bibliographic records were not machine-readable, and six had a reason specific to their institution. Only two said they anticipated joining the shared catalog project in the next three years.

Over three-quarters (77.42%) said their library participated in the MLN OCLC fixed-cost contract. (That represents all eight 4 year public universities, all four 4 year private universities, and all three 2 year community/technical colleges responding to the survey.) Of the seven who are not participating, four cited lack of funds and three gave a reason specific to their institution. None expected to begin participating in the next three years.

Over half (51.61%) cited the Montana Library Association as the continuing education/staff development workshop provider that most benefited them and their staff. Nine who cited "other" in response to this question gave the Special Libraries Association or the National Library of Medicine or a combination of sources as their most important provider.

Nearly twenty percent (19.35%) said their library had applied for an LSTA "Montaniana" digitization grant. The major reason for not applying for such a grant was the lack of significant collections to digitize, which was cited by twelve of the 25 (48.00%) who had

not applied. Some of the other reasons given were being new to the position, having missed the deadline, or doing their own digitization project.

The survey asked respondents to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops in terms of their importance to them. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

Topic	Relative mean score
Use of OCLC system(s)	3.81
Use of MLN database project resources	3.71
Information literacy/bibliographic instruction	3.68
Cooperative collection development	3.55
Creating web pages	3.33
Internet searching skills	3.26

Five respondents gave some other topic such as managing a one to two staff library and collaboration skills and techniques and gave that topic a 5 or a 4 rating.

Over seventy-four percent (74.19%) said they were willing to travel one and a half hours or more hours for a typical half-day training event. Thirty-nine percent (38.71%) were willing to travel one and a half to two hours; another thirty-five percent (35.48%) said they were willing to travel over two hours.

The survey asked which of the following services would be most helpful to your library? The choices provided were technology technical assistance, library management consulting, and workshops/continuing education opportunities. Twenty responses, representing nearly sixty-five percent (64.52%) were for workshops/continuing education opportunities.

The next question asked, "Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for academic, special, or institution libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?"   Nearly forty-two percent (41.94%) indicated the most important role setting a vision for Montana libraries. Nineteen percent (19.35%) said the most important role was including all types of libraries in resource sharing planning. Almost thirteen percent (12.90%) indicated the most important role was database licensing. All other roles received under ten percent.

School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

A survey of Montana school library and media centers was conducted via the Internet. Sixty-six responses were received. Over seventy percent (71.21%) of the respondents were library/media center directors, but staff with other job titles also took part.

Less than half, only forty-five percent (45.45%), of the respondents said their library/media center participated in a federation. The federation with the highest percent

of participants in the survey was Tamarack, with forty-one percent (41.38%) of the participants.

While there was at least one response in each of the staff size categories (the largest being over ten FTE), the highest percents came in the smaller staff size categories. Forty-three percent (43.08%) of the responses came from school media people who worked in settings with one FTE paid staff in the media center. Twenty-five percent (24.62%) were in media centers with 1.01-2.00 FTE. Another fifteen percent (15.38%) were in media centers with less than 1.00 FTE.

Of the sixty-six responses, nearly forty-four percent (43.94%) came from school media center staff personnel who had a materials and online resources budget of $1,001 to $5,000. Over seventy-seven percent (77.27) had a materials and online resources budget of $10,000 or less, but none had a budget of less than $1,000 for these resources. Only one respondent said she/he had a materials budget of $35,001-$50,000 and one other said her/his materials budget was over $50,000.

The respondents were asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) they had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over seventy-two percent (72.73%) had contacted the Montana Library Network.

MSL Department	*Percent having contacted MSL Dept.*
Montana Library Network (MLN)	72.73%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	31.82%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	22.73%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	15.15%
None of the departments	13.64%
Library Development (LDD)	6.06%

Nearly seventy percent (69.70%) subscribed to the full-text magazine databases offered through the MLN. Of the twenty who did not subscribe, thirty-five percent (35.00%) said they were unaware of the project and another thirty percent (30.00%) said the lacked the funds to do so. Only four, or twenty percent (20.00%), said they anticipated subscribing to the program in the coming three years.

Almost seventeen percent (16.67%) said their school media center participated in a shared catalog program. Of the fifty-five who said they did not participate, thirty-six percent (36.36%) said they lacked funds to participate. Another thirty-five percent (34.55%) cited other reasons, which they provided. Several examples were related to not participating in ILL, being a part of their own district's database rather than a larger database, and being unable to see the advantage to participation. Two said they needed more information. Thirteen percent (12.73%) said they were unaware of the project. Of the fifty-five, only eighteen or thirty-three percent (32.73%), anticipated joining the project in the coming three years.

Almost sixty percent (59.62%) said the continuing education provider that was most useful to them was the Montana Library Association. In second place with nineteen percent (19.23%) was the local school district; the Montana State Library was in third place with seventeen percent (17.31%).

The survey asked respondents to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops/training sessions. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

Topic	Relative mean score
Teaching library/information literacy skills	4.64
Integrating technology/information literacy into the curriculum	4.58
Internet searching skills	4.09
Use of MLN database project resources	4.02
Collection development	3.73
Creating web pages	3.30

Five gave specific topics and gave those a score of four or five. Some examples were how to integrate new standards into the curriculum, technical services training, and digital libraries and e-books.

Sixty-two percent (62.3%) said they were willing to travel between one and two hours for a typical half-day training event. Nearly thirty-three percent (32.79%) said they would travel one and a half to two hours.

Seventy percent (69.70%) said the most helpful thing the State Library could do for their media center was provide workshops and continuing education opportunities. One suggestion added as "other" was to provide a collection of professional school library materials that could be shared statewide through ILL.

The next question asked, "Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for school libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?" The choices provided were legislative advocacy, including schools in planning for resource sharing, providing better visibility for school library/media centers, providing continuing education/staff development, and providing group database licensing. Forty-two percent (41.54%) said providing group database licensing was most important. Another twenty percent (20.00%) said including schools in planning for resource sharing, and another fifteen percent (15.38%) said legislative advocacy.